

Application No. 10/821,854
Reply to Office Action of June 27, 2007

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-19 are presently active in this case. The present Amendment amends Claims 2-6; cancels Claim 1 and adds Claims 7-19.

The outstanding Office Action objected to Fig. 1 because of an informality. Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Porte et al. (U.S. Patent Nos. 6,123,170 and 6,334,588).

Claims 2-6 were indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter. In response, Claims 2-4 are rewritten in independent form. Thus, Claims 2-19 are believed to be allowable.

In response to the objection to the drawings, submitted herewith is a Letter Submitting Replacement Drawing Sheets along with one Replacement Sheet for Fig. 1 adding the “Prior Art” legend.

In response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claims 2-4 are amended to correct the noted informalities. Specifically, the expressions “can be,” “open position” and “closed position” are deleted. The claims now require a releasable connection mechanism configured to releasably connect a front edge of the fan cowl to a back edge of the air inlet structure. Thus, the claims do not recite a desired functionality that “is no longer present” in the “open position” since an engine in its open position does not necessarily have the claimed releasable connection mechanism. The claims are also amended to delete the “additional” and the “which” expressions. In view of the amended claims, it is believed that all pending claims are definite and no further rejection on that basis is anticipated. If,

however, the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned who will be happy to work with the Examiner in a joint effort to derive mutually acceptable language.

In response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. However, Claim 1 having been canceled, the rejection is now moot.


In order to vary the scope of protection recited in the claims, new dependent Claims 7-19 are added. These new claims find support in the disclosure as originally filed, for example at page 8, lines 22-31; page 9, lines 1-11; page 8, lines 10-13; page 11, lines 12-14; and Fig. 2. Therefore, the changes to the claims are not believed to raise a question of new matter.¹

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 2-19 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

¹ See MPEP 2163.06 stating that "information contained in any one of the specification, claims or drawings of the application as filed may be added to any other part of the application without introducing new matter."